

From: kim macquarrie
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/21/03 9:43AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

kim macquarrie (kimmacquar@cs.com) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein,

As a concerned US citizen, I would like to request that the fcc hold public hearings before approving the relaxation of controls over media ownership in the U.S. In my opinion, there has already been too much consolidation, resulting in a lessening of points of view in this country. Further relaxation of controls will only accelerate this process. Public hearing on this important matter will at least allow this important issue to be debated by the same American citizens who will be affected by such changes.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Kim MacQuarrie

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 198.81.26.139
Remote IP address: 198.81.26.139

From: Cheryl Flinn
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/21/03 9:51AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Cheryl Flinn (trill@operamail.com) writes:

Commissioner Adelstein: I recently saw a segment on Bill Moyers' PBS show 'Now' which profoundly concerns me. (Link: <http://www.pbs.org/now/politics/bigmedia.html>) I wish to take this opportunity to say that I, though only a private citizen, am profoundly concerned about the effect that this continuing consolidation (single mega-corp owning many media outlets in a given market) has upon dissemination of information. I see it as having a purely negative effect upon our democracy. If it cannot be reversed, I would at least request that it be allowed no further inroads. Indeed, I am old enough to remember that requirement for 'opposing viewpoints' which I saw as very healthy. Thank you, sir, for listening and I hope, through you, my voice may be heard in your upcoming decisions. Respectfully, Cheryl Flinn

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 24.116.136.185
Remote IP address: 24.116.136.185

From: Kristin
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/21/03 10:20AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Kristin (Fontaine) writes:

Commissioner Adelstein,

I am writing to ask you to get more public input about changing the FCC regulations regarding ownership of the media prior to the June 2nd vote. This issue is too important without allowing Americans to have their say.

I believe that the restrictions on ownership should not be changed. We need more diverse media in this country, not less.

Thank you,
Kristin Fontaine
Burlington, VT

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 24.54.34.132
Remote IP address: 24.54.34.132

From: Jeff Natt
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/21/03 10:28AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Jeff Natt (jrnatt@yahoo.com) writes:

I am writing to express my concern about the deregulation of media which could allow for one company to control more media outlets in one market. I believe such a change is a detriment to our right to freedom of press and information. Such a change would result in fewer and fewer points of view being expressed in our media at a time when this is more important than ever! I ask that you at a minimum hold a significant public discussion before moving forward with any dramatic changes and listen to what the public says instead of corporate lobbyists whose only interest is control and profit.

Thanks you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jeff Natt

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 66.108.188.164
Remote IP address: 66.108.188.164

From: Michael Goodfriend
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/21/03 3:18PM
Subject: Your Patriotism

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,

Michael Goodfriend

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo
<http://search.yahoo.com>

From: Melvin Mackey
To: Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell
Date: 4/21/03 8:38PM
Subject: Further Deregulation Bad for the United States

Commissioners,

I understand there is a vote scheduled for June 2 on further deregulation of broadcasting ownership. If you vote to deregulate further, this will do enormous damage to our already beleaguered democracy, putting control of information dissemination into the hands of a few. The American public needs exposure to many points of view.

Chairman Powell I urge you to put off this vote for at least 12 months so the issue can be studied and the public can be informed (commercial media is ignoring the issue totally).

If this deregulation goes through we will see greater voter apathy, a less informed public (scary considering how ill informed people are already) and a continuing decline of our democracy. Please use due caution.

Thank you,

Melvin Mackey
24430 Old Mill Rd SW
Vashon, Washington 98070

MSN 8 with e-mail virus protection service: 2 months FREE*
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/virus>

From: Marie Werner
Date: 4/22/03 12:06PM
Subject: <No Subject>

jadelste@fcc.gov, kjmweb@fcc.gov, mcopps@fcc.gov,
kabernat@fcc.govmpowell@fcc.gov

I am aware of the vote scheduled for June 2 on further deregulation of broadcasting ownership. If you vote to deregulate further this will do enormous damage to our already beleaguered democracy, putting control of information dissemination into the hands of a few whose motives are profit, not the public interest.

Chairman Powell I urge you to put off this vote for at least 12 months so the issue can be studied, so the public can be informed (commercial media is ignoring the issue totally).

If this deregulation goes through we will see greater voter apathy, a less informed public (scary considering how ill informed people are already) and this will be bad for the US and for the world. Please do not do this.

Thank you.

Tired of spam? Get advanced junk mail protection with MSN 8.

CC: Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps,
kabernant%fcc.govmpowell@fcc.gov

From: Chuck Cheesman
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/22/03 1:58PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Chuck Cheesman (midwesternsongs@hotmail.com) writes:

I strongly urge you to strengthen, rather than loosen, current restrictions on media ownership. Americans depend on the integrity of the media for our information and news. Consolidation of media ownership threatens the health of our democracy. When the majority of the media is controlled by a few companies, as it is now, it becomes more and more likely that a few powerful executives will be able to influence and compromise the integrity of information flowing from the media to the public.

As a responsible citizen, I get my news and information from a variety of sources. It is very important for me to know that this news and information is coming from a wide range of independent voices. Especially important are dissenting voices that challenge our leadership and our popularly held beliefs. Dissent leads to the kind of dialogue and debate that fuels a healthy democratic process. The presence of dissent provides checks and balances in the media, and it helps to maintain the credibility and integrity of reporting.

Unfortunately, consolidation of power in the media means that fewer voices will be heard. Loosening restrictions on media ownership will inevitably mean less competition and independence in the media. We cannot afford to rely on the benevolence and objectivity of a few powerful media giants to serve us our news. As you serve the public, you should do everything in your power to protect the public's access to independent news and information.

Respectfully,
Chuck Cheesman

1410 W. Diversey
Chicago, IL 60614
773-529-8945

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.23.177.239
Remote IP address: 68.23.177.239

From: Candy Wilson
To: john.moody, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, mark.effron, mg3, Michael Copps, Mike Powell, neal.shapiro, newshour, walter.isaacson
Date: 4/22/03 6:22PM
Subject: Children held prisoners, US admits

Madam and Messrs. --- Why have we, in this country, not been informed of this by the news outlets over which you have had such influence? There is a blackout on news events by the corporate-controlled media. Have you heard that saying, "You can fool some of the people some of the time but not all of the people all of the time?" Well, this is a case in point.

From: Torraine M. Weaver
California

To: john.moody;Jonathan Adelstein;Kathleen Abernathy;Kevin Martin;mg3;Michael Copps;mpowell;neal.shapiro;newshour;walter.isaacson

Sent: 4/22/03 3:04:07 PM
Children held at Camp Xray, US admits

Australian Broadcasting Corporation
Tuesday, April 22, 2003

<<The US military has revealed it is holding juveniles at its high-security prison for terrorists at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba, known as Camp Xray.

The commander of the joint task force at Guantanamo, Major General Geoffrey Miller, says more than one child under the age of 16 is at the detention centre.

However, Maj Gen Miller has revealed little more about their welfare.

Maj Gen Miller says the US is holding "juvenile enemy combatants" at the centre, confirming rumours of children being held.

He has refused to reveal how many there are, their exact ages or their countries of origin.

He says they are being well cared for and are kept in facilities separate to adult prisoners.

The children are still being interrogated and will continue to be held at Guantanamo.

About 660 prisoners are in the camp.

They have not been tried or convicted of any offence but are being held as part of what the US calls its war on terror.>>

) 2003 Australian Broadcasting Corporation

Read this at: <http://www.abc.net.au/news/newsitems/s836988.htm>

From: rick punke
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/3/03 10:29PM
Subject: Fwd: Baby Bell Networking sharing issue

Appreciate your repsonse to emial dated 02-03. Definitely see how hard you work and how much you do care!!!!

Note: forwarded message attached.

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Platinum - Watch CBS' NCAA March Madness, live on your desktop!

CC: rp8294@yahoo.com

From: cwa3404@bellsouth.net
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Apr 24, 2003 4:51 PM
Subject: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

Sandra Kemp
2101 N Hwy 190
Suite 202
Covington, Louisiana 70433

From: Syndi Allgood
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Apr 24, 2003 8:47 PM
Subject: FCC protect media independence

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Syndi Allgood
4168 Quinn DR.
Evans, GA 30809

From: E Dillon
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Apr 24, 2003 8:47 PM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

E. Dillon
8196 Jordan Lane
Indianapolis, Indiana 46240

From: Syndi Allgood
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Apr 24, 2003 8:47 PM
Subject: FCC protect media independence

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Syndi Allgood
4168 Quinn DR.
Evans, GA 30809

From: Syndi Allgood
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Apr 24, 2003 8:47 PM
Subject: FCC protect media independence

Dear Commissioner Powell:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner Powell, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Syndi Allgood
4168 Quinn DR.
Evans, GA 30809

From: E Dillon
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Apr 24, 2003 8:47 PM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

E. Dillon
8196 Jordan Lane
Indianapolis, Indiana 46240

From: Alison Rasch
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, Apr 25, 2003 12:33 AM
Subject: FCC protect media independence

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Alison Young Rasch
1902 Todville Road
Seabrook, TX 77586

From: Alison Rasch
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, Apr 25, 2003 12:34 AM
Subject: FCC protect media independence

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Alison Young Rasch
1902 Todville Road
Seabrook, TX 77586

From: Angsolleder@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, KM KJMWEB
Date: Fri, Apr 25, 2003 8:18 AM
Subject: Media Deregulation

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioner Martin,

As a concerned American, I write to you to oppose the proposed deregulation of the media. Never has this need been more apparent than now, with the lack of ACCURATE reporting from our already corporate-controlled media. I have had to turn to Canadian and Euro news channels to get the REAL story on Iraq. Sanitizing a war is absolutely not what this democracy needs. The broadcasting industry is already failing to serve the public. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge and consolidate further, there will be little opportunity for open and informed debates over current events. Please do not allow this to happen.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Angela A. Solleder

Rachael A. Tauber

Spencer Solleder

Saffi Solleder

62-277

From: KearLMB@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/21/03 4:53PM
Subject: TV Ownership Rules

Mr. Michael K. Powell
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street NW
Washington D.C. 200554
mpowell@fcc.gov

Dear Chairman Powell:

Re: I am in favor of maintaining, without change, the current ownership rules.

Thank you very much for holding the hearing on TV ownership on C-Span and for allowing public comments.

For the last couple of months I've attended meetings where we were told that the decision to allow cross ownership and duopolies was a done deal. In other words, that the FCC would never deny large companies the right to buy and control whatever they want. Having watched the hearing and heard the comments, I am hopeful that you are serious about listening and weighing the benefits to the public. As a consumer, citizen, director and shareholder of an independent family-owned media company, I am a seriously interested party. My experiences are as follows:

1. In 1986, our newspaper-based company purchased its first TV news station. We were aware of the possibility that at some point newspapers would be sending signals to the public either through the internet and convergence or by cable. This may seem like ancient discussions, but we were addressing the current situation. We were interested in having our people learn the skills necessary for that eventual outcome. Shortly after that, there were mass ownership changes within the country and one major organization pressured ABC to challenge our license to operate. We looked to the FCC to protect our independent station. After considerable legal bills, we were able to survive by a conditional contract with ABC. To this day, we are still requesting a standard long term contract. We do everything we can to comply with ABC's guidelines.

2. Our newspaper in Western Pennsylvania, with a circulation of approximately 30,000, has for the last couple of years operated a cable channel where we offer the public coverage of town hall meetings, school board meetings, parades, high school sports and other local events. It has been so popular with the region that in September we began a 5-day week, almost live newscast which covers local news and weather. It's been a long process where the newspaper has paid its way. Initially, revenue came from advertising exchanges with the local cable to now getting sponsorship for programming. It is a terrific model and is not done to control the market. However, as an independent we are offering far more local news than would come from any of the Pittsburgh stations.

3. We have attempted to expand this model in eastern Pennsylvania and western New Jersey, other markets where we have newspapers. The local cable company tells us that they don't have room and in fact, they have become so

large that they are attempting to have their own newscast. However, even though they try to provide local news, it is in essence regional coverage and is a far different offering from what we would do as local news gatherers.

4. The pressure to sell to large organizations because of the value of owning a market has been tremendous. In the last number of years, most of second and third generation ownership media have sold out. We have not because we believe there is a greater purpose in what we do and we affiliate with other independents who believe that they too have a sacred trust to maintain -- a high quality news gathering organization that permits a vibrant democracy.

Every change you make permitting major companies to control a majority of a market, even though there may be other competitors, makes it difficult for the lower revenue independents to survive. The reason that I have been in on so many discussions about the rule changes is because we have done specific planning to "batten down the hatches" to survive. It would be my hope that the government would value what we do enough to maintain its support of our position and that of a highly competitive multi-participant media environment.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Sandra Hardy
Vice President/Director
Calkins Media
8400 Route 13
Levittown, PA 19057

From: Jan Moore
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 3/21/03 7:01PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Jan Moore (moorebronzefoundry@att.net) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein, Please support diversity in the media by opposing the ownership by fewer and fewer mega-moguls. Our democracy is dependent on a fair and balanced media. Currently the media is right-winged with no dissent represented, Also reinstuting the "fairness doctrine" would accomplish some balance. We,(the American public),need your help more than ever before. Thank You, Jan Moore

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 12.86.28.230
Remote IP address: 12.86.28.230

From: Aaron Staker
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/25/03 2:10AM
Subject: Clear Channel Communications

Dear Sir,

Below is an article that deeply disturbed me regarding Clear Channel Communications. It is definitely in the public interest to not allow another company to gain so much control of the mass media. Clearly the company is overstepping its bounds and quite frankly is a monopoly. In my market alone I only have two choice on the AM dial, clear channel or Public Radio. This is a rediculous betrayal of the public interest.

Just another taxpayer who will recieve no response or justification.

Sincerley,

Aaron Staker
1038 Center Pt. Rd. NE
Cedar Rapids IA 52402
a.staker@mchsi.com

March 25, 2003

Channels of Influence

By PAUL KRUGMAN

y and large, recent pro-war rallies haven't drawn nearly as many people as antiwar rallies, but they have certainly been vehement. One of the most striking took place after Natalie Maines, lead singer for the Dixie Chicks, criticized President Bush: a crowd gathered in Louisiana to watch a 33,000-pound tractor smash a collection of Dixie Chicks CD's, tapes and other paraphernalia. To those familiar with 20th-century European history it seemed eerily reminiscent of. . . . But as Sinclair Lewis said, it can't happen here.

Who has been organizing those pro-war rallies? The answer, it turns out, is that they are being promoted by key players in the radio industry - with close links to the Bush administration.

The CD-smashing rally was organized by KRMD, part of Cumulus Media, a radio chain that has banned the Dixie Chicks from its playlists. Most of the pro-war demonstrations around the country have, however, been organized by stations owned by Clear Channel Communications, a behemoth based in San Antonio that controls more than 1,200 stations and increasingly dominates the airwaves.

The company claims that the demonstrations, which go under the name Rally for America, reflect the initiative of individual stations. But this is unlikely: according to Eric Boehlert, who has written revelatory articles about Clear Channel in Salon, the company is notorious - and widely hated - for its iron-fisted centralized control.

Until now, complaints about Clear Channel have focused on its business practices. Critics say it uses its power to squeeze recording companies and artists and contributes to the growing blandness of broadcast music. But now the company appears to be using its clout to help one side in a political dispute that deeply divides the nation.

Why would a media company insert itself into politics this way? It could, of course, simply be a matter of personal conviction on the part of management. But there are also good reasons for Clear Channel - which became a giant only in the last few years, after the Telecommunications Act of 1996 removed many restrictions on media ownership - to curry favor with the ruling party. On one side, Clear Channel is feeling some heat: it is being sued over allegations that it threatens to curtail the airplay of artists who don't tour with its concert division, and there are even some politicians who want to roll back the deregulation that made the company's growth possible. On the other side, the Federal Communications Commission is considering further deregulation that would allow Clear Channel to expand even further, particularly into television.

Or perhaps the quid pro quo is more narrowly focused. Experienced Bushologists let out a collective "Aha!" when Clear Channel was revealed to be behind the pro-war rallies, because the company's top management has a history with George W. Bush. The vice chairman of Clear Channel is Tom Hicks, whose name may be familiar to readers of this column. When Mr. Bush was governor of Texas, Mr. Hicks was chairman of the University of Texas Investment Management Company, called Utimco, and Clear Channel's chairman, Lowry Mays, was on its board. Under Mr. Hicks, Utimco placed much of the university's endowment under the management of companies with strong Republican Party or Bush family ties. In 1998 Mr. Hicks purchased the Texas Rangers in a deal that made Mr. Bush a multimillionaire.

There's something happening here. What it is ain't exactly clear, but a good guess is that we're now seeing the next stage in the evolution of a new American oligarchy. As Jonathan Chait has written in *The New Republic*, in the Bush administration "government and business have melded into one big 'us.'" On almost every aspect of domestic policy, business interests rule: "Scores of midlevel appointees . . . now oversee industries for which they once worked." We should have realized that this is a two-way street: if politicians are busy doing favors for businesses that support them, why shouldn't we expect businesses to reciprocate by doing favors for those politicians - by, for example, organizing "grass roots" rallies on their behalf?

What makes it all possible, of course, is the absence of effective watchdogs. In the Clinton years the merest hint of impropriety quickly blew up into a huge scandal; these days, the scandalmongers are more likely to go after journalists who raise questions. Anyway, don't you know there's a war on?